



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

MF

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|

|            |          |         |             |
|------------|----------|---------|-------------|
| 09/030,258 | 02/25/98 | SCHULTZ | R 12217-100 |
|------------|----------|---------|-------------|

TM02/1214

GREGORY S. ROSENBLATT  
WIGGIN & DANA  
ONE CENTURY TOWER  
NEW HAVEN CT 06508-1832

EXAMINER

LAO, S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2151

DATE MAILED:

12/14/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

# Interview Summary

Application No.

09/030,258

Applicant(s)

Schultz, et al

Examiner

S. Lao

Group Art Unit

2151



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Gregory Rosenblatt

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Sue Lao

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Dec 7, 2000

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: None

Identification of prior art discussed:

None

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

A copy of the reference to D. Garlan et al "An Introduction to Software Architecture" will be faxed to applicant and be included in the PTO-892 of the next Office action. It is noted that sections 3.5 and 4.6 illustrates typical blackboard architecture.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

**ALVIN E. OBERLEY**  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
GROUP 2700

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.